DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 086 EA 019 033

AUTHOR Wirt, Frederick; And Others
TITLE Multiple Paths for Understanding the Role of Values in State Policy.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 86
GRANT NIE-G-83-0020
NOTE 26p.; An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; Cultural Context; Decision Making; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Formative Evaluation; Organizational Theories; Political Attitudes; Political Power; *Politics of Education; Public Opinion; Research Methodology; Research Needs; Research Problems; Social Science Research; Social Theories; Sociocultural Patterns; State History; *State Norms; *State School District Relationship; State Surveys; Statistical Analysis; *Values
IDENTIFIERS Process Analysis; *Values Research

ABSTRACT

In a comparative analysis of values in state education policy, this paper demonstrates the need for a multifaceted methodology to understand the complexity that characterizes state sociopolitical systems. The paper refers to a study of education policy values among six states in its analysis. Identifying values and their influence form the central research questions in policy analysis. The methodology of quantitative covariation measures variables to account for policy variations; however, the focus upon selected realities excludes non-quantifiable variables of theoretical relevance. Code analysis focuses on state statutes and upon content analysis to derive historical values' interrelationships. Most states have altered value emphasis over recent decades, although the value of choice persists. Constituents' values influence policy elite through broad and narrow concerns. Quantitative and code analyses examine substative policies, but a third path describes the process that produces them. The process-oriented method deals with the perceived influence of constituents' values upon policymakers and discovers their implicit assumptive worlds. A handful of central domains can structure the assumptive worlds that are embedded within the myriad of informal accounts that appear within and among the states; analysis elucidates cultural elements in policy context. A multiple approach maximizes methodologies that ask different questions to yield different answers about complex interactions of behavior and value in political systems. Twenty-eight references are appended. (CJH)

ED278086

Multiple Paths for Understanding
The Role of Values in State Policy*

Frederick Wirt, University of Illinois-Urbana
Douglas Mitchell, University of California, Riverside
Catherine Marshall, Vanderbilt University

An earlier version of this paper was presented to the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 19, 1986. *This research was funded by a grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-83-0020). The senior author is Frederick Wirt.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frederick M. Wirt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 019 033

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Multiple Paths for Understanding

The Role of Values in State Policy

Introduction

Comparing education policy among the American states has taken on a new currency in the Reagan years of devolving programs and funding to these units. Indeed, this shift has made the traditional responsibility of the states for education--despite the rhetoric of local control--more fully active and important for practitioner and scholar of education alike. For the scholar, comparative study of policy has always had two advantages. It contributes to building theory about the political system and to learning about policy substance, implementation, and results. The larger the number of units utilized for theory testing or for empirical learning, the greater should be the generalizability and the practicality of that knowledge.

But both goals cannot be satisfied if the analysis is narrowed by the scholar's attachment to a particular method. Analytical methods provide different ways of asking questions and thus produce different understandings of a social phenomenon. Along the range of phenomenoligical to multivariate methods, each method has great utilities for adding to nowlege, but the more complex the phenomenon studied, the greater the inutilities of any given method. In this article, we demonstrate the need for employing a repertoire of methods in comparative state policy analysis just because these political systems are so complex.

This understanding is based on a recent study of six states, of which this

article is a part (Mitchell, et al., 1986). The major research question was: How do we understand the role of values in education policy among these states? We know that all policy is rooted in values and that politics is a contest among adherents of clashing values. Consequently, the two tasks of identifying the presence of these values and understanding their influence combine to form the central research question in all policy analysis, when viewed broadly.

In this project's methodological design we presumed that there was no single way of answering that central question because there are different paths to understanding or recognizing values at work in social institutions. Consequently, rather than trying to force all data into a single explanatory or descriptive mold, we accepted the analytic view that there is more than one way of comprehending the role of values.

This multifaceted approach must exist because different observers of society ask different questions which require different data and methodologies to answer. No one of these is the sovereign key to the kingdom of knowledge because there is obviously no agreement upon a single method of analysis in the social sciences, just as there is obviously no normative agreement the most important purpose of any social process. Consequently, we recognized that across the states "the" role of value depended upon the question, data and method for analysis. Therefore, the different methodological trainings and normative interests of the research team were used to explore three different paths to recognizing and understanding values in state education policy. This paper briefly reviews these paths and some findings.

The Paths of Quantitative Co-Variation

The first path is familiar from much current research. Values at work may be recognized, and their effects understood, by seeking an association between the two derived from quantitative co-variation. This methodology creates empirically measurable independent and dependent variables to be manipulated statistically. The purpose is to explain observed variations in a policy world that is described in limited but highly specified ways.

Characteristically, the design was hypothesis-driven by linking independent and dependent variables in four ways.[1] The dependent variables were judgments by education policy elites in these states. First, what did they report about the attention that their states gave to seven broad policy domains (finance, personnel, governance, testing, curriculum, materials, program, and buildings)? Second, what were their personal preferences about such attention? Third, a similar analysis asked elites what were their states' preferences on 33 program approaches within these policy domains? Fourth, what were their own preference among these approaches?

Next, the independent variables were constructed to explain variations observed in these dependent variables of domains and approaches. "Political culture" (Elazar, 1984) has been shown to influence state policy decisions in many areas (reviewed in Kincaid, 1980). While the sample states were selected for their cultural diversity, we sought to validate the concept by a novel method. Coulf the elites identify these cultural views within their own state in a fashion which woudl cluster them in accordance with Elazar's classification based on historical analysis (Wirt, 1986)? Questions of attitudes about objects in the political world (e.g., government, parties, elections, bureaucracy) had optional answers rooted in diffferent cultures. The results obtained from

multiple discriminant analysis) showed clear clustering of views in the predicted direction, that is, the elite answered as the historical analysis predicted.

Then this cultural independent variable was compared with another with a rich research literature, namely, the effect of elites' personal qualities (status, partisanship, and ideologies) upon their preferences for program approaches. Regression analysis showed, however, that culture explained much and personal qualities almost nothing. However, when national reform movements caused particular policies to get great attention, or when there is widespread disinterest in a policy, there is little interstate variation to explain by either variable (e.g., finance versus buildings and curriculum materials policy).

As illustrated briefly above, this path to understanding essentially seeks to answer the question: What is associated with selected, observed differences among the states in particular policy behaviors and attitudes? The major limitation to this path to understanding--as it also is for other paths--is that it focuses only upon selected aspects of political reality.

Why is this focus limited? First, not all variables of theoretical relevance are selected because they are not quantified or quantifiable. As a result, this method must often provide surrogate variables which are available but not necessarily the best. The "make-do" quality of this path need alsyas to be challenged because, in design terms, there is slippage between the variable as conceptualized and operationalized. A second limitation arises because causation can only be inferred after putative explanations have been demolished.

Clearly then, this path is not the only way of viewing the operation of

reality when seeking to understand values in state policy systems.

The Path of Code Analysis

Easton's (1965) influential formulation that the political system formally "authoritatively allocates values and resources" directed this project's attention to what these formal authoritative values actually are. So a second path to understanding focused upon another data set, the state statutes on education, (the code) and upon another method, content analysis. The purpose was to determine the presence and interrelationships of major values--efficiency, equity, quality, and choice. Content analysis has not been used often for studying educational policy, however, except for the civics curriculum (Henning et al., 1979) and local control of schools in state codes (Wirt, 1977).

Such code data cannot be conceptualized as dependent variables whose co-variation with independent values is to be explained, as with the first path. Rather, this path is conceptualized as the current code formally incorporating values of the past, just as analysis of policy domains and program approaches tell us about contemporary values in educational policies. The codes' "authoritative allocations" are the results of past policy conflicts about which values should prevail; in short, the official language of codes institutionalizes certain values. We can determine how interstate distributions of balues may be accounted for by historical and invironmental conditions of state life. More, these values can bee seen as a sequence of balues that become important in the natural history of educational policy.

Meaning of Values in Policy Options

Defining the four central values demonstrates the different directions that preferences for using public resources can take in public policy. Each value, moreover, is rooted an even more basic political value. the definitions and basic value were:

--Efficiency: the effort by a superior agency to require a subordinate agency to dollow specified and publicized procedures in order to oversee compliance with the former's goal. Efficiency may take an economic form (e.g., cost-benefit formulas for expenditures) or an accountability for (e.g., controlling in detail the exercise of authority at state or local levels). The root value here is that those who exercise public authority must be held responsible for its use.

--Equity: the use of public resources to improve a deficiency among students or school personnel iacking their own resources for such remedies. This value is rooted in others, namely, the worth of every person in society and the responsibility of the total society to realize that worth.

--Quality: requirements of preparation in schooling that would attain standards pre-determined by the profession or public. The root value is the crucial importance of education for a citizen's life chances and self-fulfillment.

--Choice: the availabiiity of options for allocating public resources or selecting public officials that are exercised by non-professionals, such as voters, parents, or students. The root value here is popular soverignty, namely, the legitimate authority of citizens over public officials in their policy actions.

Meaning of Values in Policy Change

Most states have changed empasis upon these values over recent decades. Efficiency was the main goal from the 1920s until the 1950s, during the "cult of efficiency" era (Callahan, 1962; Tyak, 1974); however, at the same time there was a search for quality that underlay a "child-centered", or "progressive", curriculum (Ravitch, 1983, chapter 2). However, in the mid-1950s, equity emerged as the dominant issue beginning with Brown v. Board of Education; equity remained the most important problem facing education through the 1970s.

But in the wake of the Sputnik crisis of 1957, the issue of quality began to develop as a major concern of state policy makers (Mitchell, 1982). That is, during the 1970s and 1980s, there were reports of poor quality: declining test scores, lack of positive findings from major evaluation studies, concern over declining productivity in American industry, and poor skills of entering college freshmen and army recruits. All combined to raise new quality terms like "excellence", "achievement", and "competency" in the policy debate. Through all these decades, however, the value of choice persisted in the elections of boards and superintendents, referenda on bonds and levies, and accountability schemes involving non-professionals.

The Logic of Code Values

It is evident that there are some tensions among these values. These values are clearly not heirarchical, but rather may be conceptualized as dimensions along which some values reinforce but others are opposed. A priori, we reasoned, these dimensions of opposition and reinforcement look like this:

	Quality	Equity	Efficiency	Choice
Quality	X			
Equity	Oppose	X		
Efficiency	Reinforce	Reinforce	X	
Choice	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose	X

The conflict between quality and equity are familiar in education policy, but efficiency can be empolyed to reinforce policies rooted in both quality and equity (thereby assuring they are fully implemented). but choice means that policies rooted in the other three values can be opposed or denied if the popular will prefers (e.g., referenda defeats of bond issues and desegregation during the last 15 years). A fuller exposition of this logic of analysis (Mitchell et al., 1986, chap. 5) demonstrates how values in conflict and in support act to stimulate policy origins and development.

Reflection on the history of education suggests a natural sequence to the order of values appearing in school policy. Policies pursuing quality goals comes first in efforts to create and expand free, public education; the iogic applies equally to a new educational quality goal being sought even today. Because goals are not automatically self-executing, however, them the value of efficiency comes second in the need for creating structures and procedures to implement these goals. This is manifest in the emergence of the new school professionals' notion of "one best system" run by "managers of virtue" (Tyack, 1974; Tyack and Hansot, 1982). Equity would be pursued next, when the experience of implementing quality goals shows that educational services become

maldistributed. That condition arises sometimes because of unmet needs and sometimes because of limited goals or ineffective implementation. Equity then becomes the effort by those not benefitted to acquire new resources and procedures which will assist them.

Finally, the value of choice is not part of any linear sequence, because it operates with every value and at every historical point. Logically, choice could be conceived as arising even before policies exist on a matter. That is because citizens could choose to adopt a new policy goal or not; the adoption of free, public education for Protestants, but not for Roman Catholics, in the mid-19th century is the prime example. Also, people could have chosen not to be educated at all, and as we know, many did, as census data on illiteracy in the 19th century and even today demonstrate. choice exists also in the implementation stage where efficiency values dominate. That is seen in the different means of governing local schools (from the party machine to the professional model) or of making policy decision (e.g., the use of referenda by some states but not others) (Wirt and Kirst, 1982, chaps. 5, 7). Finally, choice appears in the equity movement of recent decades. Pressure group litigation and legislative initiatives involve citizens exercising the value of choice i order to alter (or defent) maldistributions of resources for minority, the handicapped, and so on. In short, democratic principles have made the value of choice an active ingredient of school policy and have thereby affected the other three values throughout our history.

The Logic of Code Values

Nevertheless, the states have pursued all four values simultaneously in separate initiatives. However, the initiatives of the 1970s were not

comprehensive school improvement programs, but rather narrower and less vigorous actions (Odden and Dougherty, 1981; McLaughlin, 1981), much like responses to the :nation at Risk" challenge (Shinn and Van der Slik, 1985). Among the four values in the states' codes derived through content analysis, efficiency was the most prevalent and most of this took the form of accountability for the use of power. In the individualistic culture of Illinois, this value appeared in over one-half of all its code entries, most focused on the policy domain of governance. This was appropriate in a state whose citizens had always distrusted political power and had this sought to protect against its abuses by specifying controls over formal authority. On the other hand, in the moralistic culture of Wisconsin, while efficiency values are still most numerous, the proportion is much less because other values, like equity, were emphasized; this occurs in a state that charasteristically thought political power was beneficial and so to be used for the common weal (Peirce and Hagstrom, 1983).

Policy Elites' Responses to the Force of Values

How did these values emerge from the state and through its policy system into authoritative law? Answering that question takes us into the values of constitutents that stimulate that system, as well as into the differentiating effect of culture upon a policy elites' values within that system.

First note that a major factor conditioning such constituent stimuli is that elected leaders invariably wish to stay elected and that wish will influence their policy behavior to some degree. For example, congressional research finds that of all the factors possibly influencing the law-maker's vote, the most significant is the desire to be re-elected (Mayhew, 1974). The

law maker may engage in "position-taking", "credit-claiming", and local "case work", but these actions, like "vote-casting" are keyed to a common wish to be re-elected. We presumed that state legislators are shaped also by this central concern, and our field work demonstrated the idea's validity.

Two streams of influence from constituents' values should operate upon a state policy elite. One contituent stream of influence is broad, one arises from the occasional and widespread concern of citizens over a crisis, and a second stream arises from narrow but continuing interests of organized groups. the first is a "breadth stimulus" and the second an "intensive stimulus". These two influences upon state elites point to their need to act in a responsive mode, and that suggests, in turn, that their d3ecisions among values and policies will reflect in some rough sense constituent values in their states.

The Breadth Stimulus

First, if some policy problems concern everyone to some degree, and most citizens know it, then those in the policy system must also know of that concern. This borad concern may lack specifics (e.g., "Children should learn more"), but policy makers hearing about it from different constituencies will feel the pressure to "do something". This broadly-based stimulus provides policy elites quick awareness that the matter must be put on the program agenda for some action. It is only after broad concerns on the policy agenda that issue conflict emerges, over such familiar matters as timing, funding, and program content (Kingdon, 1984).

This breadth stimulus explains why the era of budget constraints after the mid-1970s made school finance so salient to so many policy actors in all the states. This is also why it ranked first in each of our six states in the attention that legislatures were giving to our seven policy domains. And this

breadth stimulates conversely explains why there was no interest anywhere in curriculum materials or buildings; the first ran afoul pervasive local fears of state control and the second would require more state expenditures. A similar breadth stimulus can be seen in widespread responses to the "Nation at Rist" report. In the first two years after its issuance, 45 states had done something in response, although the range of change varied. Eighteen states made only 1-10 changes (including PA and WI in our sample), 15 made 12-21 changed (including AZ, IL, and WV), 8 made between 23-42, and three (including CA) made 48-58 changes (Chinn and Van Der Slik, 1985, p. 39).

In short, political system variation in behavior is explainable by political actors' need to respond to issues that while broad are still pressureful. Democratic theory requires such response, and elected officials desire to respond out of their re-election concerns.

The Intesive Stimulus

But not all policy is generated by the breadth stimulus. Rather, some policies arise from the power of interest groups operating in a milieu normally filled with public ignorance of, and indifference to, those interests. Consequently, lawmakers respond not simply to mass of number but also to narrowly-focused interests--an "intensive stimulus." The rich literature of lobbying activity shows that political scientists ascribe most, if not a majority, of lawmaking to this factor (see any issue of Congressional Quarterly). Nevertheless, there has been a surprising congruence between public opinion in general and specific national public policies over the last 30 years (Weissberg, 1976; Page and Shapiro, 1982, 1983). but it is also the case that narrow group opinion makes itself heard by law makers and that its resources make law makers sensitie to its demands.

For example, in our states the influence of education lobbies was rated quite high, near that of the inner circle of elected officials (AZ is an exception). Note also that laws protecting teacher interests are stronger in states where their organizations are bigger and stronger; we find sharp contrasts in rating of their influence between CA and WVA. Nor is it surprising in states dominated by one economic interest, like the case of coal in WVA, that its interest are more clearly responded to, even at the expense of education services.

Cultural Effects

These broad and narrow constituent values directed toward policy making are affected by differing state or regional political cultures. Cultural expectations about how government should operate can help explain interstate differences in policy programs. Such expectations, socialized through institutions and experiences, shape differently such policy matters as: the mere perception of a problem's existence, the will to do something about it, and the knowledge of how to do it. For example, if, as in WI, government is viewed benevolently as an aid to the commonweal, there will be strong expectations about the high quality of public personnel and services and about government's ability to improve life. But if, as in IL, government is viewed as corruptive of the social order, there would be no such expectations. In these contrasting cultural milieus, the policy-maker's action is shaped by what one expects government to be and to do, and that, in turn, shapes the selection of values in policy domaings and program approaches. We find much evidence from interviewing state policy elite that such cultures do exist and that those have such effects (Wirt, 1986).

The Path of Process Analysis

These two paths to recognizing and understanding the role of balues in state education--quantitative and code analysis--look at substantive policies, but a third path focuses upon the process that produces them (Mitchell et al., 1986, chaps. 10-11). Much human action is purposive, that is, value-motivated, and so the actions involved in policy making can reveal latent values. the data for this process approach were drawn from interview transcripts, case reports, and an influence scale--all provided by policy elites in the six states. Several descriptive and analytical questions provided the research focus. How do political actors operate from their different parts of the policy system? Who influences the process and its outcomes? What perceptins by the policy actors shape the process and their own roles? Do basic state differences in influence give rise to different kinds of process?

There are two ways by which this process-oriented path can be studied. One deals with the perceived influence upon educational policy making by the individual members of these state elited--legislators, governor, CSSO, SEA, lobbies, and so on. The data were responses to influence scales involving a set of 18 officials, organizations, and carriers of opinion. such comparative influence assessment for education was pioneered for New England by Stephen Bailey and his associates (1962) and a subsequent 12-state study by Campbell and Mazzoni (1976). Our findings demonstrate some pervasive elements of the American political system, albeit with variations in influence were found among circles of actors in state education policy.

The Circles of Influence

Everywhere, the state legislature or key legislators are at the center of a

nested set of policy influentials--the "elected insiders". The "insider professionals" constitute the next circle--the CSSO and staff, teacher and other education lobbies. But there is some variation; CSSOs in WI have usually been much more influential, while teacher lobbies are poorly regarded in AZ. Then, a "near circle" of the governor and his staff and the legislative staff are usually highly ranked. but thereafter, other agencies appear with starkly lower marks in what we have temed the "outer circle" (state board, school board association), the "someitme players" [administrator groups, courts (but of enormous influence in WVA) federal policies (a surprise), and non-educator groups]. Finally, the "unimportant" were in the farthest circle of influence--lay groups, research organizations, referenda, and producers of school products.

The importance of such analysis is to understand that the way constituent values get translated into policy is shaped enormously by the great influence given to those most often and directly elected. If the term "elite" produces a connotation of separation from the public, not that this elite has its closest link to the voters, from which we infer that the latter's concerns, when mobilized and articulated clearly, are listened to (e.g., teacher lobbies and school lobbies in general). Neither are all public officials of equal influence (e.g., state boards), nor all unappointed actors of low influence (e.g., teacher lobbies). In short, the process of policy making at the state level acknowledges the legitimacy of the electoral imput as reflected in the legislature and its leaders.

A surprising array of other actors or agencies, such as federal policies or courts, do not appear often or strongly enough across the array of school policies to register among these states any perceived influence. This low

estimate of federal or court influence may be myopic, however, In WVA, a federal district judge recently compelled the policy system to improve its financing of local schools in a sweeping and effective manner; accordingly, his influence was rated much higher that in other states. But many provisions of state codes contain equity and due process provisions which also point to the similar influence of federal legislation and court decisions. Yet these are viewed most often as only episodic interventions, while the normal course of policy influence fastens upon the legislative scene and, increasingly, the governor's role.

The Elites' View of the Policy Process

A second way of understanding the role of values in the policy process is to deduce the implicit assumptive worlds of the policy makers, a concept drawn from parallel work by Young (1977). The method involved deducing from incidents in transcribed interviews the policy elites' operational code, that is, the rules of the game for success in making educaiton policy (Marshall, 1986). This path instructs us about what values the new members get socialized to and about how following these informal rules will ensure success in policy making. Clearly, members adopt this operational code in order to maximize their individual values. Those values include political advancement, constituency satisfaction, following party ideology, penalizing out-groups or deviant game players, and so on.

These assumptive worlds, derived from stories and rituals, are composed of four domains, each focusing upon a central question. These four and an illustration from the research are:

1. Who has the right and responsibility to initiate policy? For example, in PA, the CSSO is expected to advise the governor and work closely with key

legislators on their policy ideas, but not bypass either by using independently published reports. But the constitutional basis of this office in WI, and its elective base, give the incumbent much more power for policy initiative, although consulting with others is not ignored.

2. What policy ideas are deemed unacceptable? Usually these involve policies that trample on powerful interests, are openly defied when attempted, diverge from prevailing dominant values, and have not been tried elsewhere. However, the federal government can impose unacceptable ideas, as with the WVA federal court order on finances, and some states like CA take pride in leading the nation with policy reforms.

3. What policy-mobilizing activities are deemed appropriate? Concern here is for such behavior as: now your place and cooperate with those in power, touch all bases, bet on winners, and so on. For example, a keen awareness of a small but overarching state elite in AX means that their interest have to be ragarded in forwarding education policy.

4. What are the special conditions of the state that actors believe shap their policy making? The policy elite in WVA always know they rank near the bottom in state comparison on shcool resources, and hence they must not experiment, while CA sees itself as rich and innovative. In WI, great concern for local control has deep historical roots, as does the imperatie for merit and honesty in public servants. The special weight of needs and resources of Chicago dominate IL's policy making.

In short, a handful of central domains can structure the assumptive worlds that are embedded within the myriad of accounts that appear within and among the states. These accounts are not simply anecdotes but, when analyzed, help account for distinctive cultural elements in the policy context.

Common and Differing Elements in Process Effects

There are obvious common features of governing the American states--the familiar separation of powers, judicial review, partisan legislatures, civil rights, and so on. But these commonalities may be used in different ways to create education policy, because of differences in values, political will, and technical competence vary among the states (Gray et al., 1983).Consequently, we find elements of the state education elites vary in their influence in the policy process.

The governor might provide policy initiatives in education. Some governors do indeed have traditionally had a strong role (CA and WI), but in the 1980s in allour states they took a stronger interest in education because of the budget-cutting mood and the urge to reform school practices. But on other policy matters, governors reguiarly have exercised only limited influence. Sometimes that is because of a tradition that policy initiatives are expected to come only from the state school board or from the chief state school officer on CSSO (WVA); sometimes it is because gubernational leadership in other policy matters is not the norm (IL). However, the governor's expected role can alter because of his personal interest in education (PA), or a personal disinterest (CA's governor during this study).

Legislatures among most our states have the greatest influence on education policy making. Their capacity to govern had been strengthened in the 1970s by the addition of staff (Fuhrman and Rosenthal, 1981). They had all also taken greater interest in reducing schooling costs in the 1970s, while in the

mid-1980s they focused on improving school performance. But the legislature's influence takes different forms among the states. It is weak in policy initiative in WVA, fully active as a collective body in CA (especially in the lower house), and directed by individual legislative leaders in WI. Legislatures'decisions may be driven by fierce bipartisanship in PA and CA, or by single-party dominance in WI. Legislative staff are highly important for the total legislature's work in CA, for only the individual legislator in WI, but of limited influence elsewhere for WVA.

Leadership in policy implementation might seem to be the domain of the CSSOs, but recently they have taken greater interest in policy innovation. CSSO staffs have expanded everywhere as a result of the ESEA of 1965, particularly in research and legislative liaison (Murphy, 1980). Today they are regularly in the news, particularly in CA and WI. Their need to be elected in some states provides an independent source of political influence with the other branches. Even in states with traditionally little leadership, CSSOs have recently become more energetic and effective in obtaining federal educational resources. However, in WVA and WI, there has been a tradition of strong CSSO leadership in making reforms. In both states, however, there are differences in the vigor of CSSO oversight of local districts; WI does little but WVA much more local control by tying oversight to state funding. But other CSSOs, as in PA, operate only when there is a consensus engineered by others, particularly by the legislature, and they may be no more than the governor's chief advisor.

Equally diverse in influence is the state education agency. It is perceived as weak in AZ and IL, but strong in CA and WI. Its influence takes the form of providing ideas to the CSSO and legislature which are accepted as law. They also differ in the degree of oversight they can exercise over the districts.

Finally, the state boards of education in few places exercise much influence; it does not even exist in WI (where there is no sense that something is being missed).

SUMMARY

This project sought to understand how factors external to school policy--like culture and process--modified values inherent in current policy mechanism, program approaches, and in the historical expression of public law. This paper is an introduction to the resulting in-depth study of six states; necessarily, it can be only a sketch.

The main finding was the need to emphasize that the role of values in educational policy systems cannot employ a single path to understanding. Like the fable of blind Indians defining an elephant's totality by the different portions of its anatomy that came to hand, analysis of value must show all the pieces. Multiple paths lead to multiple understandings of the striking differences between patterns of states.

We doubt if the paths fuse as well as does a full view of that elephant. But the multiple approach maximizes the utilities of different research methodologies. They range from the search for hypothesis-based association of variables specified a priori to the search for social meaning deduced from participant observation and document analysis. Different approaches must ask different questions, and the different answers that result must lead to a fuller comprehension of the complex interaction of human behavior and value in the political system.

REFERENCES

Bailey, Stephen et al. 1962. Scholmen and politics. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Callahan, Raymond. 1962. Education and the cult of efficienty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Ronald and Mazzoni, Jr., Tim. 1976. State policy making for the pulic schools. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.

Dye, Thomas. 1966. Politics, economics, and the public. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Easton, David. 1965. A systems analysis of political life. New York: Wiley.

Elazar, Daniel. 1984. American federalism. 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row.

Fuhrman, Susan and Rosenthal, Donald, eds. 1981. Shaping Educational Policy in the States. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Gray, Virginia, Jacobs, Herbert, and Vines, Kenneth, eds. 1983. Politics in the American States. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Henning, Joel et al. 1979. Mandate for change. Chicago: American Bar Association.

Kincaid, Stephen. 1980. Symposium on political culture. Publius: The Journal of Federalism 10 (2); reprinted as Political Culture, Public Policy, and the American States, J. Kincaid, ed. Philadelphia: Center for the Study of Federalism.

Kingdon, John. 1984. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. Boston: Little, Brown.

McLaughlin, Milbrey. 1981. State involvement in local education quality issues. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Mayhew, David. 1974. Congress: The electoral connection. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mitchell, Douglas. 1982. Governance of schools. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research. H. Miskel, ed. Washington: American Educational Research Association.

Mitchell, Douglas, Marshall, Catherine, and Wirt, Frederick. 1986. Alternative Policy Mechanisms for Putsuing Educational Quality, Efficiency, and Equity Goals. Final report prepared for grant (NIE-G-83-0020) of the National Institute of Education.

Murphy, Jerome. 1980. State leadership in education. Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Odden, A. and Dougherty, V. 1982. State programs of school improvement. Denver: Education Commmision of the States.

Page, Benjamin and Shapiro, Robert. 1983. Effects of public opinion on policy. American Politcal Science Review 77: 175-90

Pierce, Neal and Hagstron, Jerry. 1983. The Book of America. New York: Norton.

Ravitch, Diane. 1983. The troubled crusade. New York: Basic.

Rosenthal, Donald and Fuhrman, Susan.

Shinn, Doh and Van Der Slik, Jack. 1985. Legislative efforts to improve the quality of public education in the American states: A comparative analysis. Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans.

Tyack, David. 1974. The one best system. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, David and Hansot, Elizabeth. 1982. Managers of Virtue. Cambridge, MA: Basic.

Weissberg, Robert. 196. Public opinion and popular government. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wirt, Frederick. 1977. State policy culture and state decentralization. In Politics of education. J. Scribner, ed. Chicago: Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press.

----------, Mitchell, Douglas, and Marshall, Catherine. 1986. Political culture, state elites, and educational values. Paper prepared for presentation to the annual meeting of the American Political Science Assn., Washington, D.C.

---------- and Kirst, Michael. 1982. Schools in Conflict. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.

Young, 1977. Values in the policy process. Policy and Politics 3(5): 1-22.